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1 August 2013

The Editor
BMC International Health and Human Rights

RE: Re-submission of manuscript ID MS: 1764057119786251 titled, ‘Factors in the Management of Feeding in Nursery School Children as perceived by their mothers in rural Bondo County, Kenya’.

Dear Dr. Crow:

We appreciate the thorough and prompt review of our work. We have made all the suggested changes in the manuscript. We have read through the comments and addressed them in a point-by-point fashion - indicated in the text of the revised version of our work (in red). It is with great pleasure that we re-submit this manuscript for publication in BMC International Health and Human Rights.

Reviewer #1

Major Compulsory Revisions

Comment 1. In my previous comments, I pointed out that it was unclear what the odds ratios presented in the results of the paper represented, i.e., it is not clear what outcome the authors have actually fitted in the logistic regression analyses. In their revision, the authors have indicated that odds ratios below 1 can be taken as 'good', while those exceeding 1 can be taken as 'bad'. However, this does not address my concern. It is paramount to understand what outcome the authors actually fitted: did they fit 'bad' feeding practice or 'good' feeding practice, or other outcome. If this is clearly indicated, then it is easier for readers to judge and understand the results. Please make this clear in the abstract as well as the analysis section of the paper.
Response 1. We appreciate the reviewer for raising this important point. For the OR analyses, we had the reference group defined as 1.00 in the regression models. In determining the association between the ‘other groups’ and feeding management, the ‘other groups’ were fitted as ‘good’ in the logistic regression model and assigned ‘0’. We have currently revised the Abstract, Methodology and Results to capture this important point. The abstract now reads as follows, ‘Regression models in which the reference group (defined as 1.00), was used to determine the association between other factors and management of feeding’ While in the Data Analysis section of the revised manuscript, we have included the following statement to make it clear, ‘For purposes of analyses, the reference group was defined as 1.00, while other factors were defined as 0 (‘good’) in the regression models. P-values #0.05 were considered statistically significant.’

Comment 2. As a follow-up to the above concerns, the title of Table 1 is not sufficient to describe the results in that table. The title of the table is “Demographic characteristics of the mothers”, whereas the table contains these characteristics, their frequencies, and odds ratios. Therefore the title of that table should be refined to incorporate these features of the results and indicate what outcome was fitted to yield the odds ratios given in that table. As it is now, it is difficult to understand that table.

Response 2. We again thank the reviewer for raising this important point. We have currently revised the titles of Tables 1-3 to capture the full details of the Tables.

Comment 3. Also, Table 2 is not clear. The table says ’Children eating habits as stratified by mother’s age’. What the table however shows is mother’s age by other family members or neighbours. There seems to be nothing about children’s eating habits. Does the eating habit here mean the person the child eats with (neighbours, stepmothers, grandmothers, etc)? If this is the case, please modify the table title to clearly reflect this.

Response 3. We appreciate the reviewer for this excellent observation. We have addressed this concern under Response #2 above.

If you have any further comments and/or suggestions, we would be happy to address these concerns.

With highest regards,

Prof. Collins Ouma, PhD